AF IFW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

KAZUAKI ANO

Serial No. 09/930,361 (TI-33184)

Filed August 15, 2001

For: LOW PROFILE BALL-GRID ARRAY PACKAGE FOR HIGH POWER

Art Unit 2815

Examiner Matthew C. Landau

Customer No. 23494

Director of the United States
Patent and Trademark Office
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that the attached document is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage for First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450,, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 or is being facsimile transmitted on the date indicated below:

11-30-04

Jay M. Cantor, Reg. No. 19,906

REPLY TO SECOND EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Sir:

In reply to the second Examiner's Answer, it is initially noted that an Examiner's Answer which appears to be substantially identical to the Examiner's Answer dated November 5, 2004 was mailed January 4, 2004, the only difference appearing to be a lack of conferees being listed in the first Examiner's Answer. A Reply Brief in response to the Examiner's Answer dated January 4, 2004 was filed January 30, 2004. The Reply Brief read as follows as is resubmitted:

In reply to the Examiner's Answer, first, the Examiner apparently takes exception to the position of appellant that claim 19 is clear and definite. However, it should be noted that claim 19 expressly states that the encapsulant does not cover the second surface. It is therefore clear that no part of the second surface is covered by the encapsulant in claim19. If any part of the second surface were to be covered by encapsulant, that it could properly be argued that the second surface is covered by encapsulant since there is no limitation provided as to any specific amount of the second surface being covered by encapsulant. It follows that claim 19 is definite in requiring that the encapsulant be confined only to the first surface and the portion of the chip which is not exposed on the second surface.

With reference to the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4 to 6 and 18 as being anticipated by Johnson under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), in addition to the arguments previously presented, claims 1, 2 and 18 specifically require that the chip mount pad be coplanar with the second surface of the reel-to-reel tape. Not only are the elements 10 of Johnson contact pads rather than chip mounts, but, in addition, there is nothing in the specification of Johnson to indicate that even the contact pads 10 are coplanar with the bottom surface of the dielectric 1. It follows that Johnson fails to anticipate claims 1, 2 or 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

With reference to the Examiner's allegation that a preamble is not accorded patentable weight, it is respectfully submitted that the independent claims herein specifically include the reel-to-reel tape as a part of the structure and, for this reason alone, the first two sentences of these claims are not in preamble form (even were it assumed arguendo that a preamble is not given patentable weight which in fact is not the law). A reel-to-reel tape is specifically claimed and is not "intended use" as cavalierly alleged by the Examiner. Furthermore, as noted above, there is nothing in the specification to indicate the coplanarity

in Johnson as alleged by the Examiner other than his unsupported allegation. Furthermore, it is not seen how an allegation by appellant that the leads 10 do not provide support for the chip and therefore require the encapsulant can support an acknowledgement that the leads provide physical support for the chip as alleged in the Examiner's Answer in the paragraph bridging pages 13 and 14.

Claims 4 to 6 depend from claim 2 and therefore define patentably over Johnson for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 2.

: With reference to the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Ikegami, it is noted that claim 3 depends from claim 2. Accordingly, this claim defines patentably over the applied references since Ikegami fails to overcome the deficiencies in Johnson as noted above. In addition, the argument presented in the Brief on Appeal is retained.

Claims 8 to 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Cheng. In addition to the arguments presented in the Brief on Appeal, the argument presented above with reference to claims 1, 2 and 18 apply since Cheng fails to overcome the deficiencies in Johnson as noted above.

Claims 19 to 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Carter. In addition to the arguments presented in the Brief on Appeal, it is noted that claims 19 to 21 depend from claim 18. Accordingly, the arguments presented above with reference to claim 18 also apply to claims 19 to 21 since Carter fails to overcome the deficiencies in Johnson as noted above. With reference to claim 22, in addition to the arguments presented in the Brief on Appeal, the features discussed above with reference to claims 1, 2 and 18 are also found in claim 22. Accordingly, the argument presented above

with reference to claims 1, 2 and 18 applies as well to claim 22 since Carter fails to overcome the noted deficiencies in Johnson. Claims 23 and 24 depend from claim 22 and therefore the arguments presented above with reference to claim 22 apply as well as the arguments presented in the Brief on Appeal.

Claims 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Cheng and Carter. In addition to the arguments presented in the Brief on Appeal, it is noted that the feature discussed above with reference to claims 1, 2 and 18 is also found in claim 25. Accordingly, these claims also define patentably over the applied references for the reasons presented above with reference to claims 1, 2 and 18, claim 26 depending from claim 25.

For the reasons stated above as well as in the Brief on Appeal, reversal of the final rejection and allowance of the claims on appeal is urged that justice be done in the premises.

Respectfully submitted,

Jay M. Cantor
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 19,906

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P. O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, Texas 75265
(301) 424-0355 (Phone)
(972) 917-5293 (Phone)
(301) 279-0038 (Fax)